



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/282,619	03/31/1999	QUAN G. CUNG	AT9-99-037	8855

7590

09/05/2002

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IAW
P.O. Box 969
Austin, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER

DAY, HERNG-DER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2123

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/282,619

Applicant(s)

CUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Hereng-der Day

Art Unit

2123

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED August 14, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____


Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). Z.

10. ☐ Other: _____


SAMUEL BRODA, ESQ.
PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:


Applicants' remarks dated August 14, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Piatetsky-Shapiro expressly teaches obtaining a target population in the last two lines of page 235. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to obtain a target population as a result by applying KID3 Algorithm as explained in Examiner's Final Rejection (page 12, lines 3-10). The Examiner uses "target group" instead of "target population" in "Response to Arguments" of the Final Rejection only because Applicants' specification refers to target group 210 in page 9, line 9.

Simoudis et al. teach performing data mining to the selected data set after the selection of a data analysis module, for example, a statistical module. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to set module-specific parameters, for example, number of attributes selected or desired statistical measure, and determine a statistical measure of difference. Besides, Piatetsky-Shapiro also discloses a simplest statistical measure of difference as explained in Examiner's Final Rejection (page 12, line 11, through page 13, line 10).

35 U.S.C. 103(a) forms the basis for all obviousness rejections. Dash et al. teach an entropy measure for determining the relative importance of variables in order for the user to gain insight into the data after the important original features are known. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by Dash et al. to apply an entropy measure as the specific statistical measure.

The Examiner believes that all the claimed inventions have been disclosed by combining Piatetsky-Shapiro, Dash et al., and Simoudis et al.


SAMUEL BRODA, ESQ.
PATENT EXAMINER